CORRESPONDENCE,

BY

E. H. SWEET,

CONCERNING

Revivals, Union Meeting-Houses, &c.

IN CONNECTION WITH

THE PINE GROVE BAPTIST CHURCH,

MIDDLETON, N. S.

Halifax, N. S.:
G. W. Baillie, Printer,
1885.

bapt coll
Y658
I48F23
1885

CORRESPONDENCE

CONCERNING

REVIVALS, UNION MEETING-HOUSES, &c.

[*To the Christian Messenger, Halifax, N. S.*]

MIDDLETON, ANNAPOLIS COUNTY.

Dear Messenger,—A few words from this field—encouraging or otherwise—may be of interest to some of your readers. While many of our churches during the past winter were blessed with extensive revivals of religion, the Pine Grove Church was without a pastor. In the month of May the venerable Dr. Bill made a short visit to this place and preached with great acceptance and profit—especially to those with whom he had labored here in the early part of his Christian ministry. As a tangible result, five were added to the church,—three by baptism and two by letter. Having received a call from the field at the close of the last College year, I accepted the pastorate for six months, intending at the expiration of that time to resume my studies at Toronto or Newton. Still hoping that I shall be able to adhere to my purpose, I have decided to hold a series of special religious services until my engagement with the Church will close. All my predecessors have gone from this field under the unanimous protest of the brethren. And so far as I am able to predict what the feeling of the people will be when I come to leave them, I will be no exception to this general rule. The field has been under the most faithful cultivation for many years; and when the reaping time comes the Church may expect a gracious ingathering of precious souls. From present indications a glorious harvest day is already dawning. The dark clouds are breaking, and the Sun of righteousness through the rent is shining upon the ripening, golden grain. Yours, very hopefully,

E. H. SWEET.

October 4th, 1884.

[*To the Editor of the Christian Messenger.*]

MIDDLETON, N. S.

Since my last communication to the *Messenger*, the Rev. J. W. S. Young—accidentally, or rather providentially—came to this place and joined us in the precious work at Mount Hanly. The word preached is proving a savor of life unto life. Sinners are seeking and finding Christ. Yours,

E. H. SWEET.

October 28th, 1884.

98812

[*To the Editor of the Messenger and Visitor, St. John, N. B.*]

MIDDLETON, N. S.

The Pine Grove Church begins the New Year with encouraging prospects. The united labors of Pastor Sweet and Evangelist Young have resulted in a great ingathering of precious souls. At Brooklyn—where *Christian* baptism was never witnessed before—13 were "buried with Christ in baptism;" at Gates' Mountain, 16; and at Mount Hanly, 24; making in all 53 baptized since the work began. To God be all the praise. More anon, E. H S.

P. S.—Having been effectually shut out of the *Union* House, the Baptists of Port George have decided, as they should have done long ago, to arise and build a house of worship for themselves.

S.

[*To the Editor of the Messenger and Visitor.*]

MIDDLETON.

Notwithstanding the inclemency of the weather, the work of grace is gloriously progressing. On Lord's Day, Feb. 8th, 7 more were buried with Christ in baptism, making 78 added to the Pine Grove Baptist Church since the gracious revival began. And the end is not yet.

E. H. SWEET.

February 9th, 1885.

[*To the Editor of the Messenger and Visitor.*]

MIDDLETON.

On Lord's Day, Feb 22nd, 20 more followed Christ in baptism, making 91 baptized and 98 welcomed to our fellowship since the revival began. In all 103 have been added to the Pine Grove Baptist Church during the present pastorate.

E. H. SWEET.

[*To the Editor of the Messenger and Visitor.*]

MIDDLETON.

We gratefully acknowledge the Lord's doings in our midst. The cloud of mercy no bigger than a man's hand, observable on Mount Hanly some months ago, has spread over all this field of labor. It was a fitting place last autumn to begin special meetings which have been carried on without cessation until the present time. The progress of Baptist principles in this section of the Pine Grove Church deserves more than a passing notice. In the "History of the Baptists," Dr. Bill speaks of "the fathers" worshipping at Mount Hanly, Wilmot, in "a Union Chapel occupied alternately by Baptists and Methodists," or "a free place of worship for all evangelical denominations,—but which had, by some means, fallen nto the hands of the Methodist brethren, by deed to the Confer-

ence." Writing autobiographically, the same venerable author says:—"I followed up this [revival] meeting with two or three more in the same house; and the good work went forward with deepening power. But as the converts wished to be baptized, and join the Baptist Church, the presiding minister of the Circuit informed me, that unless I would preach Wesleyan doctrine, I would not be allowed to preach in their chapel any more. As I was not disposed to do that, I had only to retire with the best grace possible But this obstacle thrown in the way only tended to increase the earnestness and determination of the people. Private houses were thrown open, on every hand, for preaching; and preparations were at once made to build a Baptist meeting-house. This was soon accomplished, and a large part of the community became attached to the Baptist faith." (See "History of the Baptists," pp. 73, 74, 249.)

From that time the Christian cause at Mount Hanly has been steadily progressing. Under the successive pastorates of Bros. Porter, Parker and Robbins many were brought into gospel light; and during the present revival some thirty have made the "good confession," and united with the Church of Christ.

Thus truth amid opposition has triumphed gloriously; and in the commodious Baptist meeting house, built after the union rupture, the gospel is regularly preached to a large congregation; the brethren gather twice-weekly for prayer; and a large Sunday-school, under the able superintendence of Bro. Charles A. Elliott, meets during the greater part of the year. The singing, attuned to the new imitation pipe-organ, will bear favorable comparison with the music in many of our larger City Churches.

The history of the "union Chapel," first "occupied alternately by Baptists and Methodists," latterly deeded to the Methodist Conference, and finally shut against the Baptists, has been repeated with wonderful accuracy at Port George. Following the example of their brethren at Mount Hanly, the Baptists of Port George under similar circumstances have decided to build a place of worship for themselves. They have secured a beautiful building spot in the central part of the village. "The hewers of wood" are on the grounds; and the walls are going up, for the people have a mind to work. Those who may wish to aid their injured brethren at the Port will do well to send their *dollars* to Capt. J. E. Slocomb, Port George, N. S., or the writer, and their *prayers* to the Great Throne; and the least contribution will be duly acknowledged in the proper place and time.

At Port George and Gates' Mountain many have recently professed conversion, but as yet 17 only have been baptized. Other disciples will doubtless follow their Master's example in the near future. At Brooklyn, a valley section of the Pine Grove Church, 13 were buried with Christ in baptism and raised to "walk in newness of life."

Middleton (Pine Grove), near the center (as the name might indicate) of the Annapolis Valley, and the junction of the "Windsor and Annapolis" and the (proposed) "Nictaux and Atlantic" Railways, and therefore destined to become one of the largest towns in Western Nova Scotia, forms the principal section of this large field of labor. Here too, the Lord has greatly blessed His people. The large Sunday-school under the faithful direction of Bro. S. L. Freeman has been revived, and many of the pupils have been brought to Christ. The old pulpit has been reduced to a large platform, and is occupied by choir as well as preacher, much to the improvement of all our preaching services.

In the early part of last summer the Salem Hall was removed to Spa Springs,—the well-known "Wilmot Mineral Springs," and reconstructed into a commodious meeting-house. A mighty revival has followed the special meetings there. At Victoria Vale as well as the Springs many heads of families have been brought to bow to the mild sceptre of Christ.

In all 123 have been added to the Pine Grove Church since the work of grace began,—110 by baptism, and 13 by letter and restoration. And there are more to follow. To God be all the praise.

E. H. SWEET.

P. S.—Bro. Young's labors with us have been abundant and faithful. He has endeared himself to the people, and many prayers follow him as he leaves us to aid Bro. Rowe in holding special services at Prince Albert and Margaretville.

March 25th, 1885. E. H. S.

[*To the Editor of the Messenger and Visitor.*]

MIDDLETON.

On Lord's Day, April 19th, three were baptized at Wilmot Spa Springs, making nine added to the Pine Grove Church since my last communication to the *Messenger and Visitor*, and one hundred and thirty-two since the revival began. At our last Conference meeting at the Springs, Bro. Theodore Marshall was made deacon.

April 20th. E. H. SWEET.

[*To the Editor of the Messenger and Visitor.*]

MIDDLETON.

The Pine Grove Church has enjoyed a year of unusual prosperity. Since last June 139 have been added to our number, and to-day all the various sections of the field are unitedly "striving together for the faith of the gospel." Still desirous to attend a Theological Seminary, the pastor has tendered his resignation to take effect the first of September next, or sooner if another man

can be secured to take the pastoral care. This resignation, though not as yet accepted, is final. E. H. SWEET.

May 11th.

[*To the Editor of the Weekly Monitor, Bridgetown, N. S.*]

MR. EDITOR,—In the *Monitor* of the 22nd inst., over the signature of G. F. Johnson, there appears an article in which your correspondent makes some personal references to the writer. The language he employs is so *unkind* that some of your readers have doubted if "G. F. Johnson" is the signature of the resident Methodist Minister of Middleton. But I am sorry to know that the signature over which this correspondence is conducted answers to the name of my neighbor in the Methodist ministry.

Mr. Johnson calls your attention to a short note written by "E. H. S.," and published in the *Messenger and Visitor* of Jan. 7th, 1885. In this note he takes exception to the following:—"At Brooklyn—where *Christian* baptism was never witnessed before—13 were 'buried with Christ in baptism.'" He says that "the sacrament of Christian baptism was administered by immersion in the community over forty years ago," and then refers to "an honored D. D. of the Baptist denomination." The reference is probably to Dr. I. E. Bill—who, I know, labored and baptized at Mount Hanly—an adjacent community. The Dr. himself speaks of "the fathers" worshipping at Mount Hanly, Wilmot, in "a union Chapel occupied alternately by Baptists and Methodists," or "a free place of worship for all evangelical denominations,—but which had, by some means, fallen into the hands of the Methodist brethren, by deed to the Conference." Autobiographically writing the same venerable author says:—"the presiding minister of the Circuit informed me that unless I would preach Wesleyan doctrine, I would not be allowed to preach in their chapel any more. As I was not disposed to do that, I had only to retire with the best grace possible. * * * * * a large part of the community became attached to the Baptist faith." (See "History of the Baptists," pp. 73, 74, 249.)

I am not aware that Dr. Bill has written anything respecting his early labors in Brooklyn. But this note on the early history of the Baptists at Brooklyn, furnished by the Rev. Mr. Johnson, is not less interesting to me than a quotation from the Baptist historian. Mr. Johnson, however, labors under a wrong impression. He seems to think that I penned the above purposely to deny the validity of certain baptismal services where "Christian baptism was administered by immersion," and to arrogate to myself the exclusive authority to baptize. On the contrary, I perfectly agree with Mr. Johnson on the validity of any instances he may name, where "Christian baptism was administered by *immersion*." And had I been as well informed on the early history of the Baptists in

Brooklyn at the time I wrote to the *Messenger and Visitor*, as Mr. J. seems to have been when he wrote to the *Monitor*, I would have reported the case of baptism quite differently. Moreover, should Brother Johnson himself desire to follow the example of Christ in baptism, I will hereby promise that I will wait upon him at Brooklyn next Lord's Day--or should he prefer it—I will send for some other administrator to administer the ordinance. And I will immediately forward another note to the *Messenger and Visitor*, as follows:—"At Brooklyn, where Christian baptism was administered by immersion over forty years ago, and where 13 more baptized last winter, the Rev. G F. Johnson, Methodist Minister of Middleton, was buried with Christ in baptism on May 3rd, 1885."

Another objection is raised on the ground that the statement referred to does "great injustice to the community." If I have ever wronged the people in Brooklyn, this is the first I have heard of it. As evidence that the injury inflicted was not severe, the congregations which wait on my ministry were never larger in that place than they have been since the publication of that article.

In commenting upon a postscript to this objectionable note, Mr. Johnson says:—"There is no evidence, either written or traditional of a building ever having been begun, carried forward or completed as a '*Union* House'" at Port George. Your readers will please compare this sentence with the following:—"In justice to a matter referred to in the *Monitor* of the 22nd inst., we, the undersigned residents of Port George and vicinity beg leave to state that the Port George Meeting-house—when finished and dedicated—was generally understood to be a Union House or free place of worship for all Protestant denominations." I withhold the signatures here affixed, as I wish to avoid the introduction of new names into a newspaper controversy. But I affirm that I have in my possession a document of writing in the form of the above statement to which over thirty persons subscribe (including Deacons, Ship-masters, and some five or six pew-owners of the house), and if absolutely necessary to maintain the truth, can produce a list of their names. As presumptive evidence that the house of worship was dedicated as "a Union House or free place of worship," we note two significant facts:—(1) The pews of the house, after they were sold, were more widely distributed "among the different denominations of the community" than is generally the case where the house belongs exclusively to one denomination. (2) The Baptists and Methodists both had the free use of the house for many years. This is (*a*) presumptive evidence that the place of worship was a Union House, and (*b*) proof positive that two religious bodies at least occupied it as "a free place of worship," &c. He seems quite certain, however, that the Baptists have not been shut out of the meeting-house —Union or otherwise—at Port George. This is the first time that I have known or even heard of any one attempting to deny that the

Rev. J. H. Robbins and the Baptist congregation that waited on his ministry were shut out of the Port George meeting-house. If no "records" have been kept on this case, the *traditional* evidence to which he appeals in another place is about universal. Mr. Johnson says, "the hope was fondly cherished that our young brother would take the advice of the members of his own church, who are sorely grieved at his course, and recall his statements." That the members of my own church are sorely grieved at my course I have never heard before, that they have advised me to recall my statements is *not true*. He thinks that I have not learned the art of quoting scripture, but does not point out the instance of misquotation, or even suggest a rule of Rhetoric for my general improvement.

In Mr. Johnson's quotations from my objectionable note in the *Messenger and Visitor*, have your readers yet detected any personal reference to the Rev. G. F. Johnson? Have they seen any reference to a Methodist Church or Board of Trustees? Have they recognized *anything* in the spirit and tone of that note which calls for the use of his *choice epithets and expressions*, a few of which we subjoin as follows :—

"On what grounds does the young divine assume such *self-superiority*," "he so *pompously* ignores," "so thoroughly sick of seeing *his 'burial'* of the '13' repeatedly noticed in the different papers—*dressed up in the different forms after the fashion of patent medicine notices—that they are ready to suggest cremation and pass on*," "*apt to take mere assertions at considerable discount if at all, and look for somethiny more—even from the Rev. Enoch H. Sweet, B. A.*," "his hold upon the public confidence, as a correspondent, would be wonderfully strengthed *if he could completely master the art of quoting a passage of scripture*." "*dissatisfied* with the inspired penman," "if he *persists in falsifying* the action of honest men, *he will find himself 'effectually shut out' of heaven*," &c. (Here the italics are mine.) Finally, do your readers justify a Gospel preacher in the use of such *unkind*—not to say *ungentlemanly* and *unchristian* language—respecting a Christian ordinance and Christian brother?

Middleton, April 27th. E. H. SWEET.

[*To the Editor of the Weekly Monitor.*]

DEAR EDITOR,—Another long article over the signature of G. F. Johnson appears in the *Monitor* of the 6th inst. But there is no attempt made by Mr. Johnson to answer my letter of the 27th ult. He devotes two-thirds of a column to the Union Chapel of Mount Hanly. He says, "a part of the phraseology under [my] quotation points is not found in the Dr.'s 'History of the Baptists' at all. The capital 'U' [in union] is a counterfeit." The "counterfeit" thus discovered very probably belongs to the type-setter, and

not to me. But utterly unable to find *anything* else that bears the semblance of a mistake, he seeks refuge behind a capital "U," and charges me with "garbling, forging and re-arranging of historic statements," and with "marshalling of miscellaneous and fragmentary statements under the pretence of appeal to history and palming them off as the distinctive utterance of a Church historian of recognized authority." After all these rhetorical flourishes, he does not find one—*absolutely one*—instance of misquotation. Permit me here to reproduce these three troublesome quotations relating to the Chapel at Mt. Hanly. The first and second form a description of the meeting-house :—(1) "a union Chapel occupied alternately by Baptists and Methodists," further described as (2) "a free place of worship for all evangelical denominations, - but which had, by some means, fallen into the hands of the Methodist brethren, by deed to the Conference." The third quotation gives a part of Dr. Bill's own experience during a revival of religion there. It reads as follows:—(3) "I followed up this meeting with two or three more in the same house; and the good work went forward with deepening power. But as the converts wished to be baptized, and join the Baptist Church, the presiding minister of the Circuit informed me that unless I would preach Wesleyan doctrine, I would not be allowed to preach in their chapel any more. As I was not disposed to do that, I had only to retire with the best grace possible. But this obstacle thrown in the way only tended to increase the earnestness and determination of the people. Private houses were thrown open on every hand, for preaching; and preparations were at once made to build a Baptist meeting-house. This was soon accomplished, and a large part of the community became attached to the Baptist faith."

The man who will deny the above quotations from Dr. Bill's "History of the Baptists" (pp. 73, 74, 249), will deny anything. But Mr. Johnson discovers that a Methodist invited the Dr. "to preach in the Methodist Chapel." The sentence from which he gathers this information begins with line 24 and page 73 of the "History of the Baptists," by Rev. I. E. Bill, D. D., and reads as follows:—"Among the rest, a special call from Mount Hanly came from the local leader of the Circuit, for me to preach in the Methodist Chapel, originally built as a free place of worship for all evangelical denominations,—but which had, by some means, fallen into the hands of the Methodist brethren, by deed to the Conference." That our Methodist neighbor should quote to the third comma only, and "*strikingly omit*" the latter part of the sentence, is—to use his own expression—"strikingly *suggestive*." After the revival broke out, "the presiding minister of the Circuit" forgot (?) his special invitation, and informed the Dr. that unless he would preach "Wesleyan doctrine" he would not be allowed to preach in that house any more,—"free place of worship for all evangelical denominations,—but which had, by some means, fallen into the hands of the Methodist brethren, by deed to the Conference." That speaks

loudly against the "presiding minister," and explains Mr. Johnson's "Union rupture." The manner in which our good neighbor labors to vindicate "the local leader," and to show by the aid of choice slang and opprobrious epithets that I misquote Dr. Bill reminds me of the sign a mechanic once placed over his shop door, —"all kinds of *turning and twisting* done here."

It may be true that there are "not enough Baptist people in the whole community to fill one" meeting-house at Port George; but that forms a most miserable excuse for shutting them out of "a free place of worship for all Protestant denominations." The "high pressure" that came upon the people was not attributable to "the characteristic ardor of a political campaign." It had its origin in a *higher* source, even in Christ who went down into the water and came up out of the water. (Matt. 3 : 16; Mark 1 : 9, 10.) Mr. Johnson says, "a defeat was felt to be so shameful that an apology was thought to be in order in the neighboring pulpit for *not converting* Port George." I have never heard anything of this "defeat" or "apology" before. Possibly he may refer to "a defeat" of his own somewhere, and "an apology" he has made himself at some time in "a free place of worship for all evangelical denominations,—but which had, by some means, fallen into the hands of the Methodist brethren, by deed to the Conference." He thinks somebody lingered round "to steal a march" on some community. Probably this lingerer is identical with the "young divine" of his first letter. But really much of his choice phraseology more fitly describes some other party or parties, who hoisted the gate of a mill-pond at Port George "to pervert the right ways of the Lord," who broke away a dam at Brooklyn for the same purpose, and who threw a dog from the rail of a vessel into the baptismal waters at Margaretville to ridicule the Lord's ordinance. The *ne plus ultra* of "the onslaughter" called for retribution; and the fatal sentence is repeated by the Rev. G. F. Johnson in the following language:— "So clearly did the Lord stamp the whole procedure with His righteous disapproval that not one took to the water." Notice the *cause*—the Lord's "righteous disapproval," and the *effect*—"not one took to the water." It is probably in consequence of the Lord's "righteous *disapproval*" that Bro. Johnson has not taken to the water; but we hope that the "righteous disapproval" may be withdrawn, so that our Methodist neighbor may yet be permitted to follow the footsteps of Christ *down into* the water and *up out of* the water.

E. H. Sweet.

Middleton, May 8th, 1885.

[*To the Editor of the Monitor.*]

Dear Editor,—I called the place of worship at Port George a Union House, for reasons which may be briefly indicated as follows:— (1) Some of the projectors of the house canvassed "the region round

about" for aid to build a Union Meeting-house. And the Baptists in different places responded to this solicitation. Notwithstanding Mr. Johnson's statement that "the records do not show that a cash contribution of even *one dollar* was ever made towards its building funds by a Baptist," there are Baptists who positively affirm that they gave *more than one dollar* in cash for the construction of—what was promised to be—a Union House at Port George. Mr. Johnson's "records" must be lamentably defective. (2) There is "evidence, either written or traditional," of a Union Circle, a Union Tea-meeting, &c., in connection with the building of a meeting-house at Port George. This forms some excuse for calling the place of worship a Union House. (3) Either at the dedication services or at the sale of the pews, some promises were made which look in the direction of Union. One of these promises has survived the attrition of the years, and is confirmed by many "living witnesses." It even found its way into print about the year 1880, as follows:—"When the Baptists put their money into the house [at Port George], a verbal pledge was given that the house should be *free for the use of all denominations except the Roman Catholics, when not occupied by the Methodists.*" That such a pledge was given I have not a shadow of doubt. (4) In a late communication to the *Monitor*, I gave some presumptive evidence which supports the idea of Union. As Mr. Johnson has taken no notice of that part of my letter, permit me to call your attention to it again. (*a*) The pews of the house, after they were sold, were more widely distributed among "the different denominations of the community" than is generally the case where the house is known to belong exclusively to one denomination. (*b*) The Baptists and Methodists both had the free use of the house for many years. This is *presumptive evidence* that the place of worship was held as a Union House, and *proof positive* that two religious bodies at least occupied it as a free place of worship, &c. (5) Once more I commend your attention to the following statement, to which over thirty names are subscribed:—"We, the undersigned residents of Port George and vicinity, beg leave to state that the Port George Meeting-house—when finished and dedicated—was generally understood to be a Union House, or free place of worship for all Protestant denominations."

This is *traditional* evidence overwhelming. Yet Mr. Johnson says "There is no evidence, either written or traditional of a building ever having been begun, carried forward or completed as a *Union* House" at the Port. Do not bring up his favorite charges now,—"garbling," "falsifying" and "forging." But as he promised "to shed some light on a matter which is largely of local importance," we will wait for a stray beam to fall on this sentence.

But *traditional* evidence must vanish before the searching light of "records" and "documentary evidence." Mr. Johnson resurrects "the Deed" of the land on which the house was built; and lo the mysterious "document" thus called to account, sweeps every-

thing before it—Deacons, pew-owners, &c. (thirty-three men all told), besides fair promises and public pledges—like the withering breath of despotism in the Dark ages. We quote a specimen clause from this dangerous instrument of "documentary evidence." Please read it carefully:—"in further trust that no doctrines shall be taught in the said buildings or erections on the said land and premises contrary to the doctrines contained in four volumes of sermons and certain notes on the New Testament, published by the Rev. John Wesley, formerly of Lincoln College, Oxford." The provisions herein specified, how grandly *exclusive;* and "the doctrines contained in four volumes," &c., what an invaluable mine of theology! No mortal ever discovered such riches before! *Mirabile dictu, mirabile dictu!* Wonderful to tell, wonderful to tell!!

Then we are informed by Mr. Johnson that "the deed of the land," on which these doctrines contained in "four volumes," &c., should be taught, "was legally executed and recorded *more than one year* before the Church was finished and dedicated." The deed so early given was most fitting (?), especially as the Union canvass was going on at the same time, and the promises were being repeated in "the whole region round about," that the house was going to be "a free place of worship for all Protestant denominations." Then the meeting-house is ready for public services; but the land, on which the house stands, twelve months before had been deeded away for the exclusive purpose of teaching "the doctrines contained in four volumes of sermons and certain notes on the New Testament, published by the Rev. John Wesley." This legally means—"*Wesleyan doctrine" and nothing else here.* And yet on that very spot, (the Deed to the contrary notwithstanding) a verbal pledge was publicly given that "the house should *be free for the use of all denominations,*" &c What a piece of gigantic imposition! Lift high the resurrected Deed and Mr Johnson's query higher,—"Is not 'honesty the best policy' even in building a house for the Lord?" Yes! yes! *A thousand times, yes!* "Honesty" and "light" and justice too!!

The Rev. J. H. Robbins did not consult "the doctrines contained in four volumes," &c. He preferred the Bible. What a grand mistake! He was shut out of a (so-called) free place of worship for all Protestant denominations at Port George. The Rev. I. E. Bill, D. D., was once preaching at Mount Hanly,—not "the doctrines contained in four volumes," &c., but the truth as revealed in the Scriptures. His mistaken course resulted in a "Union rupture." Let the Dr. himself describe the situation.—"I followed up this meeting with two or three more in the same house; and the good work went forward with deepening power. But as the converts wished to be baptized, and join the Baptist Church, the presiding minister of the Circuit informed me that unless I would preach Wesleyan doctrine, I would not be allowed to preach in their chapel any more." The good Dr. nevertheless describes this house from

which he had now "to retire with the best grace possible," as "a union Chapel occupied alternately by Baptists and Methodists," and as "a free place of worship for all evangelical denominations,—but. which had, by some means, fallen into the hands of the Methodist brethren, by deed to the Conference." But Mr. Johnson charges me with "garbling" and "forging" in these quotations from the author of "Fifty Years with the Baptists" My reply to this libellous accusation is most *emphatic and decisive.* If I cannot find every word above quoted from Dr Bill on pages 73, 74 and 249 of the "History of the Baptists," I will hereby promise Mr. Johnson that I will contribute to him ($100) *one hundred dollars* for the purpose of building on any chosen site *another* Union Meeting-House to be deeded away to the Methodist Conference.

E. H. SWEET.

P. S.—Mr. Johnson prays over "the documentary evidence." A sacred writer suggests prayer with *thanksgiving* in everything. (Phil. 4 : 6.) Now the Baptists participated in the building of two Union Houses (so-called formerly), one at Mt. Hanly, the other at Port George—which houses Mr. J. occupies as property belonging exclusively to the Methodist Society. He should be thankful for Baptist benevolence to his society. The Baptist Meeting-houses at Lawrencetown and Prince Albert have been used by Mr. J. several months for regular preaching services (and I hear without charge too); for all such unmerited kindness he should be very grateful, if indeed he has *any heart or any gratitude* about him But his "kind return" for what the Baptists have done for him and his cause finds expression in an unprovoked *personal* attack on a Baptist minister, and an unlimited amount of slander on a Baptist community.

May 23rd.

E. H. S.

[*To the Editor of the Monitor.*]

DEAR EDITOR,—The timely letters of your worthy correspondents, —"Censor" and W. H. Matthews, Esq.,—suggest the following queries:—(1) Which one of the clergymen (G. F. Johnson or E. H. Sweet) made the *personal* attack upon the other? (2) Which has used repulsive slang? (3) Which is author of the charges,—"garbling," "falsifying," and "forging?" I answer, my neighbor in the Methodist ministry. Perhaps I should not have taken *any notice* of a writer whose heated anger would dictate the following,—"if he persists in falsifying the action of honest men he will find himself 'effectually shut out' of heaven." But his damaging charges were sent to the *Wesleyan*, Halifax, N. S, and to the *Messenger and Visitor*, St. John, N. B., as well as to the *Weekly Monitor*, Bridgetown, N. S.; and published throughout all these Maritime Provinces. I thought (though perhaps wrongly) that the charges of "garbling," "falsifying," and "forging" thus published so widely, demanded a

reply in at least one of the papers. Hence my correspondence to the *Monitor*. Of the character of Mr. Johnson's charges and my replies, your readers can best judge for themselves.

In the *Monitor* of the 27th ult., Mr. Johnson, writing on a subject not involved in his discussion with me, labors to find "a distinction without a difference," and to aim another blow at me and the Baptist congregation of Middleton. But I hereby promise, Mr. Editor, that I will pay no attention to this new issue, unless he yet directly and personally charges me, in the same connection, with "garbling," "falsifying," "forging," &c. Finally, in regard to this most unpleasant newspaper controversy, covering some six or seven numbers of the *Monitor*, I further promise you and the readers of your valuable paper, that I will not occupy any more of your space *in meeting* Mr. Johnson's personal attacks than he occupies *in making* them.

Yours sincerely,

E. H. SWEET.

June 1st.

[*To the Editor of the Monitor.—(A new advertisement.)*]

WANTED.

A valuable work answering to the following description given in the Deed of the Port George Meeting-house, "four volumes of sermons and certain notes on the New Testament, published by the Rev. John Wesley, formerly of Lincoln College, Oxford." Any one who will sell this work to the undersigned at a reasonable price, or any one who will even send to him the address of the company or companies that publish the "four volumes," &c, will greatly oblige,

Yours truly,

Middleton, N. S., June 11th, 1885. E. H. SWEET.

A GENERAL REVIEW.

In a recent issue of the *Messenger and Visitor* there appears a brief editorial in which the editor acknowledges the receipt of a letter from the Rev. G. F. Johnson, Methodist Minister of Middleton. This communication, we are informed, was published in "the *Wesleyan* and the Bridgetown *Monitor*, taking Rev. E. H. Sweet to task" for contributing a religious report to our denominational paper. The manner in which the judicious editor finally disposes of Mr. Johnson's *unprovoked* personal attack is characteristic of the mature wisdom always observable in the editorials of the *Messenger and Visitor*.—"The tone and spirit of the communication are not such as to make it a kindness to publish it."

I have not seen Mr. Johnson's letter or letters (if indeed he has published more than one) in the *Wesleyan;* but I have read and

answered all that a petulant writer could produce on "a matter which is largely of local importance" in the *Monitor*. The character of my opponent, as well as the style of his writing, may be judged from his vile effusions on the subject of baptism. We note two of these corrupt deliverances as follows:—(1) "The news readers are getting so thoroughly sick of seeing his 'burial' of the '13' repeatedly noticed in the different papers—dressed up in the different forms after the fashion of patent medicine notices—that they are ready to suggest cremation and pass on." The second is no improvement on the first. (2) "My horse went down into the water and came up out of the water, but that was not baptism; nor do I see any necessity for one man taking another by the scruff of his neck and plunging him under the water." (See *Monitor* of April 22nd, and May 27th.)

The "patent medicine notices" to which Mr. Johnson refers, were first written out by an Apostle, sent to different churches and published very widely—"dressed up in the different forms," &c., representing New Testament baptism under the symbol of a "*burial*"—not a "sprinkling," or a "cremation and pass on." (Rom. 6: 4, 5; 1 Cor. 10: 1, 2; Col. 2: 12.) In alluding to certain baptismal services at Brooklyn, my opponent declares that "Christian baptism was administered by immersion," thus acknowledging that "*Christian* baptism" is identical with "immersion." But his description of a New Testament baptismal scene is given in language most repulsive and vile—"one man taking another by the scruff of his neck and plunging him under the water." Desperate indeed must be the cause that demands the use of such slang respecting an ordinance of the Gospel.

Mr. Johnson began the controversy in the *Monitor* by stating that he wished "to shed some light on a matter which is largely of local importance." During the course of the discussion "*some* light" has been "shed" on the "scruff of his neck," the "patent medicine notices," the "cremation and pass on" and similar expressions; but by far the *strongest* light has been shed on the Union Meeting-houses, which have "by some means, fallen into the hands of the Methodist brethren, by deed to the Conference." In this "light" so copiously "shed," the readers of our local paper are now able to trace the "decline and fall" of two Union houses in connection with the Pine Grove Baptist Church—*one* at Mount Hanly and *the other* at Port George.

"The history of the decline and fall" of the Union house at Mt. Hanly was outlined in the *Monitor* by three quotations from Dr. Bill's "History of the Baptists." The first and second form a decription of the house of worship, and read as follows:—(1) "a union Chapel occupied alternately by Baptists and Methodists," and (2) "a free place of worship for all evangelical denominations,—but which had, by some means, fallen into the hands of the Methodist brethren, by deed to the Conference." The third quotation gives an

autobiographical account of the Dr's expulsion from this "free place of worship for all evangelical denominations." (3) "I followed up this meeting," the Dr. writes, "with two or three more in the same house; and the good work went forward with deepening power. But as the converts wished to be baptized, and join the Baptist Church, the presiding minister of the Circuit informed me that unless I preached Wesleyan doctrine, I would not be allowed to preach in their chapel any more. As I was not disposed to do that, I had only to retire with the best grace possible." Utterly unable to meet these quotations in any other way, my opponent charged me with "garbling," "forging," and "palming them off as the distinctive utterance of a Church historian of recognized authority." To this accusation I gave, in my last letter published in the *Monitor*, the following *decisive* reply:—"If I cannot find every word above quoted from Dr. Bill on pages 73, 74 and 249 of the 'History of the Baptists,' I will hereby promise Mr. Johnson that I will contribute to him ($100.00) *one hundred dollars* for the purpose of building on any chosen site *another* Union Meeting-House to be deeded away to the Methodist Conference."

The history of "a free place of worship for all evangelical denominations" at Mt. Hanly has been repeated with wonderful accuracy at Port George. The Union enterprise at either place succeeded admirably for a number of years. The very term "Union" when applied to the meeting-house at Port George called up the sympathy and support of all denominations. As evidence that the euphonious word produced a very popular impression upon an unsuspecting Baptist community, we summarize from the *Monitor* the following:—(1) Some of the projectors of the house canvassed "the region round about" for aid to build a Union Meeting-house. And the Baptists in different places responded to this solicitation. Notwithstanding Mr. Johnson's statement that "the records do not show that a cash contribution of even *one dollar* was ever made towards its building funds by a Baptist," there are Baptists who positively affirm that they gave *more than one dollar* for—what was promised to be—a Union Meeting-house at Port George. Mr. Johnson's "*records*" must be lamentably defective. (2) There is "evidence, either written or traditional," of a Union Circle, a Union Tea-Meeting, &c., in connection with the building of a meeting house at Port George. The Tea-meeting labelled "Union" called together the Baptists as well as the Methodists from far and near. (3) Either at the dedication services or at the sale of the pews, some promises were made which completely annihilated every objection to a Union Meeting-house. One of these promises has survived the attrition of years, and is confirmed by many "living witnesses." It even found its way into print about the year 1880 in the following form:—"When the Baptists put their money into the House [at Port George], a verbal pledge was given that the house should be *free for the use of all denominations except the Roman*

Catholics, when not occupied by the Methodists." The natural effect of this pledge publicly given, we learn in part from Mr. Johnson's own language,—"the different denominations in the community have secured pews and occupy them." To this we add a statement published several years ago, *viz.* :—that "Baptists own about one-third of the pews" in the Port George Meeting-house. (4) These fair promises and public pledges (which were kept for a while) left little doubt in the minds of the people as to the undenominational character of the house. To show that public opinion was settled on this point, I submit the following statement, to which, even at the present date, over thirty men affix their signatures :—" We, the undersigned residents of Port George and vicinity beg leave to state that the Port George Meeting-house—when finished and dedicated—was generally understood to be a Union-house, or free place of worship for all Protestant denominations."

In the light of the foregoing the readers of the *Monitor* can well afford to question the assertion made by Mr. Johnson, that "There is no evidence, either written or traditional of a building having been begun, carried forward or completed as a '*Union* House'" at the Port. Indeed *traditional* evidence respecting a Union House could scarcely be more abundant and overwhelming.

Our Methodist neighbor, however, summons to his aid a vast amount of "records" and "*documentary* evidence," and labors to show that "the Church in question" was built "'*for the benefit of the members of the Wesleyan Methodist Church or Society in the said locality of Port George.*'" He quotes *a clause* from "the deed of the land on which the Church stands" (which clause legally prohibits all but the Methodists from occupying the house); and then triumphantly boasts that the deed was "legally executed and recorded *more than one year* before the Church was finished and dedicated." Thus the "light," *shed* on "a matter which is largely of local importance," reveals a world of hidden dishonesty. Look at the picture. Some, in "the region round about," pushing the canvass for a Union House; others, at home, labelling the Circles, the Tea-Meetings, &c., with the fair-sounding word "Union;" and still others, in the County Recorder's Office, recording a Deed which legally shuts the house against all denominations but the Methodists. See the situation in the light of this carefully worded clause, which Mr. Johnson quotes from the Deed as follows :—" in further trust that no doctrines shall be taught in the said buildings or erections on the said land and premises contrary to the doctrines contained in four volumes of sermons and certain notes on the New Testament, published by the Rev. John Wesley, formerly of Lincoln College, Oxford." Note the only legal interpretation that can be given to such a clause—"*Wesleyan doctrine*" *and no other doctrine in this house.* Hear, on the same spot, (the Deed to the contrary notwithstanding) the public pledge given when the pews were ready for sale, viz. :—"the house shall be *free*

for the use of all denominations," &c. Behold in its true light the gigantic imposition ! *Mirabile dictu, mirabile dictu ! !*

Mr. Johnson informs the readers of the *Monitor* that "the Board of Trustees have always accorded to ministers of the different denominations a cordial welcome to the pulpit;"—*a cordial welcome* accorded to ministers who would subscribe to the "doctrines contained in four volumes," &c., but *a closed house* accorded to others. The *latter* was accorded to the Rev. J. H. Robbins as the following published report clearly shows:—"Our meetings [at the Port] were held in a meeting-house in which Baptists own a large number of pews, but the *Deed* of which is held by the Methodist Conference. As soon as God gave us converts and we baptized them *in the right way*, we were shut out." (See *Christian Messenger*, Jan. 7th, 1880.) Having thus violated—as he was told—"*the qualifying clause of the Deed*," my esteemed predecessor went to his "next appointment, after the second Baptism, and found no admittance" to "a free place of worship for all Protestant denominations."

The clause of the deed resurrected by Mr. Johnson satisfactorily explains other Union ruptures. It sheds "some light on a matter which is largely of local importance" at Mt. Hanly, viz.,—Dr. Bill's *expulsion* from the "union Chapel," described in the following manner:—"as the converts wished to be baptized, and join the Baptist Church, the local leader of the Circuit informed me [Dr. B.] that unless I would preach Wesleyan doctrine, I would not be allowed to preach in their chapel any more. As I was not disposed to do that, I had only to retire with the best grace possible." The doctrines contained in the "four volumes," are very probably indentical with "*Wesleyan doctrine*." "*The qualifying clause*" of this resurrected document also affords an explanation of the "Union rupture" at Maitland. The Rev. J. E. Blakeney, in the *Messenger and Visitor* of the 10th inst., writes,—"we baptized 9 willing converts, 8 of these were from Maitland." That was sufficient. The Methodist brethren knew that these candidates were consulting the New Testament more than the "four volumes," and that the Maitland Meeting-house—though built by the aid of the Baptists—had not been deeded to the Methodist Conference to afford such liberty with the Scriptures. Hence Bro. Blakeney further writes:—"we were told that we could have conference meeting and preach once a month, provided we would not preach Baptist sentiments. Up to that time we had not said a word on the subject of baptism, although our Methodist brethren had discussed the subject two evenings. So faithfulness to God and His Word compelled us to withdraw from this house, seeing we were denied liberty of conscience and free speech." "*Baptist sentiments*," we discover, are "contrary to the doctrines contained in four volumes," &c.

Thus history at Mt. Hanly is repeated at Port George, history at Port George is repeated at Maitland, and history at Maitland is repeated in many other places throughout these Provinces. Let us

hear the conclusion of the whole matter—subscribe to the doctrines contained in the "four volumes," or vacate the Union Meeting-houses, which have, "by some means, fallen in the hands of the Methodist brethren, by deed to the Conference."

A CAUTION.

To conclude the discussion of the subject of Union Meeting-Houses, permit me to quote a few sentences from a timely article on "Encouragement and Caution to Baptists," published several years ago in the *Christian Messenger*:—"In some places it may be thought necessary to build a 'Union House'—about which, however, there will sometimes be 'disunion'—but when you join in such a house be careful about the *Deed*. You may be told that the Methodist Conference is a body corporate, and thus in a position to hold property, and that it is safer for the property to be deeded to some such body, therefore it will be less trouble and *all right* to have it thus arranged. Be not deceived by such sophistry. If you think you must have a Union house, contend—if need be—for a Board of trustees composed of representatives of the denominations concerned, and have the property deeded to such Board of trustees for the use of those denominations. (Perhaps it would be well if some of our brethren, acquainted with the legality of such matters, would give us the proper course to pursue in such cases. The above is simply my opinion from a knowledge of several such cases.) The experience of our brethren at Port George is the same as that of our brethren in a number of other places in the Province."

By heeding the *Caution* the unsuspecting will avoid "disunion," and thus preserve "the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace."

E. H. SWEET.

Middleton, June 20th, 1885.